

Appl. No. 09/508,878
Reply to Office Action of September 5, 2003

REMARKS

Claims 2-10 and 12-14 are currently pending in the present application. All of these claims stand rejected. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in light of the following comments.

Claims 2-6, 8-10, and 12-13 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnston et al. (U.S. patent no. 5,787,360), Saegusa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,864,599), and Haraguchi (U.S. Patent No. 4,979,205). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons.

In rejecting claim 12, the Office Action asserts that Johnston et al. teaches the claimed feature of "transmitting a request for identification with an acknowledgment signal via the radio connection between the mobile unit and the base station. In support of this assertion, the Office Action refers to column 5, lines 40-42 and 49-50 in Johnston et al. This cited section of Johnston et al., however, merely teaches that, upon making contact with a base station 12, a radio unit requests an identifier. A control unit 36 sends an "accept" message to the radio unit informing of the mobile identifier and a seed value from which the radio unit can independently derive an authentication code. In contrast, claim 12 features separate elements of "transmitting the identifier by a radio connection between the mobile unit and the base station" and transmitting a request for identification with an acknowledgement signal via the radio connection between the mobile unit and the base station." Thus, the "accept" message taught by Johnston et al. is essentially the equivalent of "transmitting the identifier" and does not entail the further element of "transmitting a request for identification with an acknowledgment signal." If anything, lines 49-50, column 5 of Johnston et al. teach a transmission of an acknowledgment signal, albeit via a radio connection, and not a request for identification with an acknowledgement signal. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that this element is not taught or suggested by Johnston et al., contrary to the assertions in the present Office Action.

The Office Action also asserts that the featured element of "transmitting the acknowledgment signal via a local connection, separate from the radio connection, between the mobile unit and the base station" is taught by the combination of Haraguchi with the teachings of the other cited references. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion and submits that although Haraguchi teaches transmission of a command signal CMND from a base unit 2

Appl. No. 09/508,878

Reply to Office Action of September 5, 2003

through contacts 278, 178, the command signal including an identification code ID. However, specific teaching in Haraguchi concerning the transmission of data using the cradle/charging contact is more for the purpose of echoing back an identifier rather than transmission of an acknowledgment signal.

Moreover, the stated motivation to include the teaching of Haraguchi with Johnston et al. and Saegusa et al. does not specifically address why one of ordinary skill in the art would have utilized a local connection verses a radio connection for sending an acknowledgment to a base station separate from the radio connection. That is, the stated motivation is "to ensure that the base station knows the cordless phone has received the registration information." However, this purpose could be served by a radio transmission in the system of Johnston et al. and know teaching or suggestion is given to one of ordinary skill in the art that a local connection would be more desirable in the system of Johnston et al. than a radio connection to achieve this purpose. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the putative motivation to combine is, in fact defective since it only illustrates that, for the sake of argument, the references could be combined, but falls short in providing the motivation that suggest the desirability to combine. Indeed, the reason for this feature in the present invention is irrelevant to the teachings of Johnston et al. In particular, the reason for employing a local connection to transmit the acknowledgment signal is to confirm that log on is in fact implemented with a mobile unit actually resting on a base station and not, for example, with some other mobile unit. In the telecommunication system of Johnston et al., which connects base station via a LAN with mobiles switching between base stations, this feature along with its underlying reason for existence are irrelevant and, thus, not particularly desirable to the system of Johnston et al.

The Office Action also asserts that Saegusa et al. teaches the claimed feature of "memorizing the received echoed back identifier." Applicants respectfully disagrees. In particular, contrary to the assertions in the present Office Action, Saegusa et al. does not teach or suggest a memorization or storage of a received echoed back identifier. Rather, the referenced sections of Saegusa et al. (i.e., column 3, lines 48-67 and column 4, lines 1-10 teach storing a different identifier, which is the previous identification number and telephone identification number).

Appl. No. 09/508,878
Reply to Office Action of September 5, 2003

Additionally, this claimed feature is also not disclosed by Johnston et al. or Haraguchi. With respect to Haraguchi, in particular, the identification code ID is stored, not an echoed back identifier. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this feature is further not taught or suggested by the cited references, either combined or taken separately.

With respect to independent claims 13 and 14, these apparatus claims feature elements performing the similar acts of claim 12 and, thus, are believed to be allowable at least due to the reasons presented above with respect to claim 12.

In light of the foregoing comments, Applicants respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and requests that a timely notice of allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,
BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY DRAFT
Patrick B. Law
Reg. No. 41,549
P.O. Box 1135
Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135
Phone: (312) 781-6801

Dated: _____